UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1992/SR.9
21 February 1992
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

GOVERNING COUNCIL

Special session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 9th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 14 February 1992, at 6 p.m.

President: Mr. BREITENSTEIN (Finland)

CONTENTS

Assistance to Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, the Sudan and Yemen

Preparations for the fifth programming cycle (continued)

Human Development Report

Closure of the session

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 6.05 p.m.

ASSISTANCE TO DJIBOUTI, ETHIOPIA, KENYA, SOMALIA, THE SUDAN AND YEMEN (DP/1992/L.12)

1. The PRESIDENT drew attention to draft decision DP/1992/L.12 entitled "Assistance to Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, the Sudan and Yemen".

2. Mrs. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America), introducing draft decision DP/1992/L.12, said that it was the result of a consensus reached after wide-ranging consultations.

3. Draft decision DP/1992/L.12 was adopted.

4. The PRESIDENT noted that the Governing Council had completed its consideration of agenda item 2.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE FIFTH PROGRAMMING CYCLE (continued) (DP/1992/L.11; draft decision)

5. The PRESIDENT drew attention to draft decision DP/1992/L.11 entitled "Preparations for the fifth programming cycle: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Belarus and Ukraine", which he had prepared, as far as the available services had permitted, after intensive consultations.

6. Mr. ADOUKI (Congo) said that although he was aware that the proposed text was the result of close consultations that could not be called in question and although the Congo itself had, during the general debate, supported the extension of UNDP action to the five countries of Eastern Europe, that debate had demonstrated clearly that additional resources would have to be found. The following preambular paragraph might therefore be inserted in the draft text: "Taking into account the views expressed by different delegations, especially with regard to the mobilization of additional resources,".

7. Mr. BELL (India) felt that a considerable increase in the number of recipients might be expected in the future and that UNDP would therefore sooner or later have to ask donors to increase resources accordingly. Although he was naturally delighted that the five countries of Eastern Europe would be receiving UNDP assistance in the future, accounting incidentally for only an insignificant proportion of overall IPF resources, it should nevertheless be pointed out that donors could not both grant countries the right to receive UNDP assistance and at the same time refuse to provide additional resources to finance that assistance, invoking, for example, internal political or structural difficulties in the countries in question. Additional resources were required to ensure that there was no exception to the principle of universality. The following two provisions might therefore be added to the text under consideration in a wholly constructive spirit and with a view to taking everybody's concerns into account:

(Mr. Bell, India)

"4. Also requests the Administrator to inform relevant donor countries that the admission of new recipient countries will increase the urgency of supplementing UNDP resources so as to meet the requirements of the increasing number of recipient countries;

"5. Further requests the Administrator to report on the responses of donor countries to his communications at its thirty-ninth session."

8. Mr. JALLOW (Gambia) agreed that there was an urgent need to request fresh contributions of funds, both to attain the objective of an 8 per cent growth rate in resources and to meet new needs. The Gambia had supported unreservedly the extension of UNDP support to the five countries of Eastern Europe, but those countries' needs would have to be met in the long term as well as in the immediate future. The proposals submitted by the representatives of the Congo and India therefore deserved to be taken into account; it was simply a matter of amalgamating them.

9. Mr. ADOUKI (Congo) supported the proposal by the representative of India, which seemed to complement his own.

10. Mr. KABIR (Observer for Bangladesh), noting that the results of the latest pledging conference had been disappointing and that it was more necessary than ever to make an appeal to countries capable of contributing funds, associated himself unreservedly with the proposals of the representatives of the Congo and India.

11. Mrs. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) did not really see why people were quibbling over the proposed text: the countries with whom the representative of India wished to raise the question of resources were present. As far as the United States delegation was concerned, it had stated its position during the general debate. Moreover, the members of the Governing Council were clearly aware of the implications for UNDP of the admission as recipients of the five countries under consideration.

12. Mr. AVALLE (Observer for Argentina) also expressed concern over the lack of additional resources and strongly supported the proposal of the representative of India.

13. Mrs. GASTEAZORO (Observer for Nicaragua) also supported the proposal of the representative of India, having been deeply disturbed to learn that the IPFs allocated to the countries of Eastern Europe would not be financed by additional resources but by drawing on UNDP reserves, a state of affairs that was bound to prove harmful to the developing countries in the long run.

14. Mr. LUEDIG (Observer for Estonia) said that he was somewhat surprised at the new proposals. Financial questions had been far from the minds of the five countries of Eastern Europe when they had requested the recipient status, their sole concern having been to receive UNDP technical assistance. Now that

(Mr. Luedig, Observer, Estonia)

they had been accorded the right to request UNDP assistance, however, it seemed that conditions were suddenly being attached to that right at the last minute. There was a serious danger that such an approach would discourage countries contemplating the possibility of filing an application in the future. Provisions concerning donors should be set out in a separate text and not in a decision of admission.

15. Mr. BELL (India) stressed that it was not the developing countries that wished to impose conditions, but others who insisted on proceeding step by step with great caution. The developing countries were extremely pleased that the Eastern European countries had been admitted as UNDP recipients but, at the same time, recipients were disturbed, one and all, to find that resources were not growing as they should be.

16. Mr. KANE (Mauritania) noted that the problem of additional resources had been raised by numerous delegations. If current resources, which were already inadequate, were allocated to the countries of Eastern Europe, there would be nothing left for other countries. The proposed text should therefore bring out the need to increase those resources.

17. Mr. AFANASYEV (Russian Federation) quoted paragraph 4 of Governing Council decision 91/24, which in his view dealt with the concerns that had been expressed, and proposed as a compromise that a reference to that provision should be inserted in the text under consideration.

18. The PRESIDENT said that he would agree to a simple reference to the problem of resources being added to the text that he had submitted. He proposed to hold immediate consultations on the matter.

The meeting was suspended at 6.50 p.m. and resumed at 8.50 p.m.

19. Mr. KABIR (Observer for Bangladesh), reporting on the informal consultations, said that it had been decided by mutual agreement to leave draft decision DP/1992/L.11 as it stood and to propose a new draft decision concerning preparations for the fifth programming cycle.

20. The PRESIDENT submitted the two texts to the Governing Council for adoption.

21. Draft decision DP/1992/L.11 was adopted.

22. The new draft decision on preparations for the fifth programming cycle was adopted.

23. Mrs. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) said that UNDP must place its experience at the service of the newly independent States, but without reducing its assistance to the developing countries.

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT REPORT (DP/1992/13)

24. The PRESIDENT said that common ground had not yet been found in the informal consultations on agenda item 6. He proposed to continue without awaiting those consultations.

25. Mr. ADOUKI (Congo) expressed regret that the informal consultations had not produced a text that would enable the Administrator to continue preparing the Human Development Report 1992. Beyond mere economic growth, the notion of development included social development and the improvement of living conditions, human resources development and respect for all dimensions of human rights, including political freedoms and economic and social rights. The question as to whether freedom was conducive to development or vice versa was of crucial concern to many countries, especially at a time when the resources that could be mobilized for development were few and far between. It was important, therefore, that delegations continue their discussions on that subject.

26. Mr. BELL (India) said that his delegation had done its utmost to promote a compromise whereby a report dealing with all aspects of human development could be prepared, since such a document was essential for the advancement of all developing countries.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

27. After an exchange of courtesies, the PRESIDENT declared the special session of the Governing Council closed.

The meeting rose at 9.15 p.m.